R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 003 934 48

THE PREPARATION OF COLLEGE TEACHERS OF MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGES.

BY- MACALLISTER, ARCHIBALD T.
MODERN LANGUAGE ASSN. OF AMERICA, NEW YORK, N.Y.

REPORT NUMBER NDEA-VI-17 PUB DATE 15 AUG 63
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.09 HC-$1.96 49P.

DESCRIPTORS- *MODERN LANGUAGES, *TEACHERS COLLEGES, *CONFERENCES, LANGUAGE PROGRAMS, LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION, CONSULTANTS, *LANGUAGE TEACHERS, PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT, *PROGRAM EVALUATION, COLLEGE INSTRUCTION, HIGHER EDUCATION, NEW YORK CITY, NEW YORK

BASED UPON DATA GATHERED IN A SURVEY OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHER COLLEGE EDUCATION PROGRAMS, LEADERS IN THE PROFESSION WERE CALLED TOGETHER TO DISCUSS AND MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS ON EXISTING PROBLEMS. THE CONFERENCE CONSISTED OF 18 PARTICIPANTS AND OBSERVERS WHO WERE PRESENTED WITH SUFFICIENT DATA TO DESCRIBE CONDITIONS AND DISPARITIES. STUDIES PREPARED FOR THE CONFERENCE WERE DISCUSSED BY THE CONFEREES. THE STUDIES INCLUDED (1) THE TEACHING ASSISTANT IN UNDERGRADUATE INSTRUCTION, (2) THE UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM FOR FOREIGN LANGUAGE MAJORS, AND (3) THE GRADUATE PROGRAM. EVALUATION BY THE CONFEREES INDICATED THAT MERELY TO STATE THE QUALIFICATIONS NEEDED FOR LANGUAGE TEACHERS WAS NOT ENOUGH. A CORRESPONDING DEVICE WOULD BE NEEDED TO MEASURE RELATIVE ACHIEVEMENT. RECOMMENDATIONS WERE SUGGESTED AS TO STANDARDS OF COMPETENCE FOR BEGINNING FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHERS AS A SOLUTION TO THE PROBLEM. GUIDELINES ALSO WERE DISCUSSED FOR PLANNING AND ADMINISTERING COLLEGE LANGUAGE TEACHER INSTITUTES. (RS)

ED003934

17

THE PREPARATION
of
COLLEGE TEACHERS OF
MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGES

A Conference Report
Prepared and Edited
by
Archibald T. MacAllister

For the Modern Language Association of America
Pursuant to a Contract with the U.S. Office of Education
Department of Health, Education and Welfare

AUGUST 15, 1963

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

THE PREPARATION

OF

COLLEGE TEACHERS OF MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGES

A Conference Report

Prepared and Edited

By

Archibald T. MacAllister

For the Modern Language Association of America
Pursuant to a Contract with the U. S. Office of Education
Department of Health, Education and Welfare

August 15, 1963

CONTENTS

		Page
I.	BACKGROUND OF THE PROJECT.	1
II.	THE TEACHING ASSISTANT IN UNDERGRADUATE INSTRUCTION. . .	5
III.	THE UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM FOR FOREIGN LANGUAGE MAJORS. .	10
IV.	THE GRADUATE PROGRAM	23
V.	EVALUATION	34
VI.	NDEA SEMINARS FOR COLLEGE TEACHERS	37

I. BACKGROUND OF THE PROJECT

In December, 1951, the Modern Language Association reasserted its original policy of including among its official concerns pedagogical matters involving modern languages which had been ignored since the 1920's for various cultural and historical reasons. The MLA took this step, not because its members had grown less devoted to scholarship, but because they were reminded of an ancient truth, so axiomatic that it had been nearly forgotten: that a widespread neglect of language will erode, and eventually destroy, the foundation on which literary scholarship must build. That the neglect existed was known by many, including college admissions officers, the Foreign Service, even graduate departments of Arts and Sciences which saw its effects in the shrinking language competence of their entering students. What no one knew was its extent. Since effective action cannot be taken without an accurate assessment of the situation involved, including statistical support, the MLA's new Foreign Language Program was launched in 1952 to gather facts and figures and take whatever measures possible to stop the trend.

As it ended its first decade, the FL Program (as it came to be called) could look back with justifiable gratification, though without complacency, on what had already been accomplished. Its fact-finding had made possible that influential document, The National Interest and Foreign Languages by William Riley Parker, now in its third edition. It had contributed significantly to the shaping and passage of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. It had developed new teaching

materials on the elementary, secondary and college levels. It had defined the proficiencies to be expected of foreign-language teachers and devised means of testing them. Its most noteworthy accomplishments in that decade will be seen, however, to have centered around the area known in Education as K-12. It was not that college and university problems had been neglected; it had seemed rather that higher education would best be served by paying concentrated attention first to the broad base on which our whole educational structure rests. During those ten hard-working years most problems of foreign languages in the schools had been attacked, if not solved. Among the high-level issues remaining, perhaps the most important, surely the most sensitive, was better teacher-preparation.

This, then, was among the FL Program's chief preoccupations as it entered its second decade. And indeed the nature and magnitude of the problem were such as to constitute a second phase of the Program, at once the outgrowth and the culmination of what had gone before. From the exploratory planning there emerged a sense of the complex interrelationships involved: undergraduate instruction, in liberal arts colleges rather than in teachers colleges, produces the largest number of high school teachers of foreign languages. These teachers, in turn, determine the attitudes and skills which students bring to college, and by which their achievement in this field is largely governed. The degree of success and achievement in college foreign language teaching determines the number of graduates who will return to the high schools to teach. It also determines the number who will go on into graduate school to work toward the master's and doctor's degrees and thus replenish the supply of teachers and scholars in colleges and universities.

And what happens to these last in graduate school will in turn exert a powerful influence on undergraduate instruction, where the whole process seems to have its roots. It has seemed clear, therefore, that improvement of teacher preparation must focus initially on the graduate school as the institution which is responsible for shaping not only teachers, but teachers of teachers.

In this area, as with the plight of foreign languages ten years before, everyone "knew" what the situation was, but no one had mustered evidence in support of his "knowledge." So here again, the first step was fact-finding. The foreign language departments of universities granting the Ph.D. in modern foreign languages were circularized by the MLA for a description of the local situation with respect to teaching assistants, courses in teaching methods, and other relevant data. The replies were disappointing but not unexpected. They provided ample evidence of the disparity of topics treated under the heading of teacher preparation and the number of pertinent areas they left untouched. As a second stage, a detailed questionnaire was designed and circulated. Through patient persistence, returns were obtained from 52 foreign-language departments in 39 universities, located in 30 states and the District of Columbia.

The Modern Language Association was therefore prepared in December, 1962, to undertake, with United States Office of Education support, the present study in the area of the preparation of foreign-language teachers. For the MLA, it meant the benefit of outside help to implement this new dimension of the FL Program. For the Office of Education, the MLA provided professional contacts and the accumulated experience of ten years of the FL Program.

The design for the project which emerged was simple: to convene a small group of leaders in the profession, chosen from among those interested both in pure scholarship and professional training; to present to this group data sufficient to describe existing conditions; and to elicit from them suggestions and recommendations to be passed on to the profession in the form of the present report. And so it worked out, except that the first Conference on the matter (16-17 March, 1963) aroused such lively discussion that the conferees called for another meeting. This had to be held late in the year (27-28 May) when several members were unable to attend because of commitments abroad. What follows consists chiefly of studies prepared for those conferences by the Project Director, Archibald T. MacAllister, supplemented by statements and programs made or endorsed by the conferees. All parts have been subsequently reviewed and endorsed by the participants:

Deming Brown	University of Michigan
David M. Dougherty	University of Oregon
Donald M. Frame	Columbia University
C. R. Goedsche	Northwestern University
Otis H. Green	University of Pennsylvania
Kai-yu Hsu	San Francisco State College
Archibald T. MacAllister	Princeton University
Helen M. Mustard	Columbia University
Howard L. Nostrand	University of Washington
Henri M. Peyre	Yale University
Jack M. Stein	Harvard University
Bruce W. Wardropper	Duke University
Joseph K. Yamagiwa	University of Michigan

(Also participating in the Conference as observers were:

John H. Fisher	Modern Language Association
Donald D. Walsh	Modern Language Association
Wilmarth H. Starr	MLA-NYU Language Testing Center
Bruce Gaarder	U. S. Office of Education
D. Lee Hamilton	U. S. Office of Education)

II. THE TEACHING ASSISTANT IN UNDERGRADUATE INSTRUCTION

Whatever the origin of the use of graduate students as college teachers, it is safe to assume that altruism was not the only factor. The present situation, as revealed by the MLA questionnaire, suggests that in many universities the assistantship serves two purposes: to subsidize graduate education, and to provide low-cost, minimum-commitment manpower. Its use is certainly widespread; it is practically axiomatic that wherever there is graduate work, there will be teaching assistants. Of the 52 departments from which questionnaires were received, only one made it a policy not to employ graduate assistants. Of the remaining 51, 41 or 80% used an average of 45% of their students working for the M.A. as teachers. In seven, this percentage ran from 70% to 90%; in three institutions, every student in this category was so employed. The participants of the Conference were uniformly agreed that whatever virtue the assistantship may have if it is treated as apprentice teaching, it should not come during the student's first year of graduate work. This year is almost inevitably a time of transition, of groping, and of orientation. For the sake both of the beginning graduate student and the undergraduates he would teach, it should not be complicated by the intellectual and emotional demands placed upon the beginning teacher. Nevertheless, only nine of these departments have a rule against hiring first-year graduate students. In the other 42 departments, that is 82%, first-year graduate students are regularly used as teachers. To appreciate the meaning of this fact, as it affects the undergraduates taught by these assistants, it may help to think of

the beginning first-year graduate student as essentially a successful college senior, older by three months, and perhaps poorer by what he may have forgotten over the summer. One probably should not even raise the question of the professional ethics involved in entrusting so much regular classroom instruction to persons who are only the raw material from which competent teachers may eventually be made.

As to the training given these assistants before or during their first experience, the questionnaires show a confused but sorry picture, partly because some respondents seemed preoccupied by the effect of their replies to these questions, and partly because the situation with regard to methods courses proved to be more complex and varied than could be accommodated by a questionnaire. As a result, these replies are less reliable than those in other areas. We can, however, begin with one undisputable and sobering fact: 30 of the 51 employers of assistants, or almost 60%, state unequivocally that they give no training in teaching. Six, who listed some training, mistake Linguistics for Methods; each of these is valuable, but the two are not interchangeable. Every teacher of language should have a basic knowledge of general linguistic theory and of the contrastive elements of English and the foreign language he teaches. But this is an area as distinct from classroom method as literary history or criticism. In a half-dozen instances, courses which at first glance seemed to be in methods for college teachers were revealed by related correspondence to be something else. In several cases, these were part of programs for secondary-school teachers which by syllabi and detailed descriptions were shown to be unsuitable for the higher level. Several others referred to weekly or bi-weekly staff meetings, most of which were devoted to administrative details; there was no systematic

discussion of teaching involved.

From the questionnaires it is clear that the average department a) does nothing to help its assistants learn the art of teaching, b) makes no arrangements for class visiting, and c) provides no effective supervision. Some chairmen went so far as to disclaim any interest in the problem; others simply refused to acknowledge its existence. In some departments there were individuals in charge of lower-division language-teaching who felt they had, or ought to have had, responsibility for supervision, but simply could not assume it as an extra burden in an already heavy schedule.

In the few institutions which give no formal methods instruction but feel a responsibility for training their assistants, a faculty member is allowed teaching credit for supervision. Such a person usually holds a pre-term briefing session, meets with the assistants periodically, and sets up a schedule of visits to their classes, followed by conferences. This would seem to represent the best current practice, outside of those rare departments which give regular methods courses for graduate students and assistants.

Another section of the questionnaire provides information as to how and where the assistants are used. In 48 of the 51 departments, they are used from 3 to 6 hours, chiefly in the elementary course. Thirty-one of the departments regularly use assistants also in the intermediate course, but there is a general tendency to reserve this level for assistants with experience, often those working for the Ph.D. Incidentally, 48% of doctoral candidates also teach, and that percentage would undoubtedly be higher without the spectacular increase in financial aid available to graduate students.

The questionnaire provides some information as to the amount of freedom and responsibility assistants are allowed in the classroom, and the amount of guidance they are given. In 10% of the departments replying, teaching assistants are entrusted not only with teaching a class but with the supervision of an entire course. In a little more than half the departments, assistants are responsible for planning the assignments for their sections, sometimes, however, under supervision. In 23 cases they work from assignment-sheets prepared by a senior instructor. Twenty departments reported that they give their assistants a detailed daily teaching plan; from other evidence, including letters, it would seem that this answer represents the confusion of a list of daily assignments with the detailed teaching plan. In the very few instances in which such a plan was really used, the fact was not only unmistakably clear but sample plans were enclosed.

When the above results of the questionnaire had been digested by the Conference, they agreed unanimously that conditions were at least as bad as had been feared, and that it was clearly time that steps be taken to improve the situation. Fortunately, suggestions for improvement were provided by the happier evidence of the questionnaire. This showed that at least ten universities, including three of the country's oldest and most scholarly, have introduced graduate courses in the teaching of modern foreign languages in college. The only regrettable feature is that in general they are not compulsory, except for teaching assistants. In several instances, no teaching is permitted the first year, and the methods course is taken concurrently with the first teaching during the student's second year. Some of the most recent courses were inspired by the department's experience as host to an NDEA Language Institute; in these instances,

courses in linguistics, or culture, or both, either accompany the methods course or are planned for later introduction.

The Conference felt that the above measures constitute an encouraging trend on the part of the profession itself to make graduate programs relevant to the professional needs of their students. Since it is the profession itself which has already taken the lead, the Association's role becomes one of gathering and disseminating information, including the recommendations of groups such as the present one.

III. THE UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM FOR FOREIGN LANGUAGE MAJORS

Although the focus of the present study is the preparation of college teachers of modern foreign languages by the graduate school, it is difficult to say at just what point this preparation begins. Many facets of the teacher's formation, some of them enormously important, such as taste and personality, have their roots in childhood. Foreign languages themselves constitute a discipline which is cumulative to an unusual degree. It seemed, therefore, that it was necessary to reach back at least to the immediate foundation of all advanced study, the undergraduate college.

The undergraduate college - the college of arts and sciences of a large university as well as the small, independent liberal arts college - is in the peculiar position of being both the supplier of raw material to the graduate school, and, in the Humanities, the largest market for its product. In 1958, according to figures quoted by Berelson,[1] 82% of that year's recipients of doctorates in the Humanities went into college and university teaching. This interdependence makes what each does in its own realm extremely important to the other. Nowhere is this more true than in foreign languages and literature. Failure of the undergraduate college to provide a relatively easy command of the language and familiarity with its literature, as well as some understanding of how to treat the individual literary creation, will necessarily have a serious effect on what the graduate school can accomplish in a given time.

---

1. Bernard Berelson, Graduate Education in the United States, N.Y., 1960, p. 50

There is no need to speculate about this situation - the profession has been living it for years. Graduate students have too often been observed caught in the frantic scramble to repair almost irreparable defects in fundamentals, and harried by a sense of inadequacy and frustration. Whether they give up in despair, or leave with the hope of finishing later, or even struggle through to the doctorate, they will never be the persons - or the teachers - they might have been. Quantitatively and qualitatively, the colleges and their students suffer.

It is consequently in their own interest for colleges and universities to reexamine their undergraduate foreign-language programs in every dimension. Clearly the underclass, i.e. lower division courses in language, whether they are for beginners or for those with secondary-school preparation, should emphasize functional control of the language. Many colleges are already finding their entering students more skilled in the use of the language than they have been for many years. Inertia in college departments should not be allowed to waste this improvement. For some colleges, this may mean only a matter of more accurate placement, and for this purpose a more comprehensive and reliable set of instruments has been prepared, the Cooperative Classroom Tests.[1] These will be ready in January, 1964, and can be had for <u>all</u> the language skills, including speaking. Some departments will have to do more than place their students more carefully. They will need to raise their sights, and overhaul both their methods and objectives to cope with the results of Mr. Conant's effective exhortation for better and longer language study, and the improved teaching in the secondary schools

---

1. <u>MLA Cooperative Foreign Language Tests</u>, Cooperative Test Division, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey

beginning to flow from the language development activity of the NDEA.

Because of this trend toward better language preparation in the secondary schools, some college planners have stated that the beginner's course will be greatly reduced, or may even disappear. Circumstances tend to render this improbable in the field of modern foreign languages for some time to come. Many high schools, especially in the more sparsely settled areas, still offer only Latin; and in 1961 it was still true that 39% of our high schools offered no foreign language at all. As a result, many students will come to college with Latin as their only foreign language, or with no foreign language at all. If they are to learn a modern foreign language (and this is a graduation requirement in a growing number of colleges), they will have to begin it in college. In addition to providing for these students, the beginner's course will also be needed to serve the increasing numbers who wish or need an additional foreign language, perhaps one not widely available in the high schools.

In fairness to those students who will need it, the beginner's course should not only not be further neglected, but should be given the time and treatment required by the learning process involved. The neglect is understandable; since the elementary course stands lowest in the hierarchy of departmental offerings, and its students are bound to know less than the weakest members of the teaching staff, these are the ones frequently assigned to teach in it. Yet the learning situation in a beginning language course in college involves a potentially painful psychological conflict. Freshmen especially, having not too long before put away childish things, are anxious to show their ability to operate on an intellectual plane; a modern language, if its study is to give results worthy of the

time and effort entailed, must be learned first as a motor skill, a process much more acceptable to children. A situation of this sort calls obviously for all the resources of a skilled and experienced teacher; instead, the task is often entrusted to untrained and inexperienced teaching assistants who, as the MLA questionnaires revealed, conduct without supervision 80% to 90% of this difficult, sensitive work in some of our largest universities.

Recognition of the fact that learning a modern foreign language is a motor-skill process means that college administrations will have to provide more than the traditional three contact-hours a week for beginner's courses. Success in that skill, as in any other, requires regular, frequent practice, and, in the early stages, the practice must be supervised. (The truth of this will be confirmed by any college or university athletic department.) To ask for necessary special treatment and extra time for language is, after all, to ask for no more than has come to be regarded as a natural right by the laboratory sciences. The necessary scheduling readjustments might well create some difficulties in the beginning, but it would certainly seem more fitting for the administration to endure any such temporary hardships than for language departments to continue to struggle under handicaps which make it impossible for them to give their students adequate training. To question the need for this training would be idle today, more than five years after an Act of Congress has declared widespread improvement in training in modern foreign languages to be a matter of national concern.

To help college administrations and language departments adjust their language programs to meet the new objectives, the Conference urged:

1. That elementary courses in modern foreign languages be so

scheduled as to insure one contact-hour a day.

> The two patterns most commonly used to meet this requirement are a) autonomous classes or sections usually meeting five days a week with the same instructor, and b) lecture-demonstrations accompanied by drill. In the latter type, the large sections usually meet three times a week on alternate days under the course director, and are then subdivided into small drill-groups, also meeting three times a week. The drill-groups are usually staffed by native informants or others of junior rank.

2. That classes in all language skill courses on whatever level be rigorously limited in size.

> In the conventional class-type course, experience has shown that satisfactory results cannot be accomplished with groups of more than 15 or 16 students. In the lecture-demonstration-drill type of course, the lecture-demonstration has been known to vary between 50 and 75 students, but the number of students in drills must not exceed 10.

3. That all language courses employ modern methods including an audio-lingual (aural-oral) approach, unit-presentation, pattern practice, visual aids and language laboratory, and maximal use of the foreign language.[1]

It should be noted that, in the experience of universities which for years have used the more intensive elementary course referred to above, the added hours and faster pace change the customary ratio of one college term to one high school year so that most products of such a course can compete successfully with students who have had three years of the language in high school. At this rate, by the beginning of his junior year an average student should be able to undertake a major program such as is outlined hereafter. It is understood that the less

---

1. Although a discussion of programmed instruction is beyond the scope of this study, mention should be made that experiments in this area are being conducted in foreign languages. If successful, they would obviously have a powerful impact on the subjects just treated.

gifted may require extra courses, during the academic year or in the summer, in order to attain a respectable minimum level of achievement at graduation.[1]

The Conference agreed that, in expectation of the better prepared freshmen of the future, the course which introduces the undergraduate to the foreign literature would probably need as careful review as those discussed above. Though this function is performed at different levels on different campuses, the Conference had in mind a level where the students have acquired sufficient language proficiency to understand simple lectures, cope with substantial reading assignments, participate in discussions, and write short papers. The students' reaction to their first course at this level often determines their future interest in the subject. With large numbers of freshmen ready to take such a course at entrance, or shortly thereafter, members of the Conference felt that the profession would face a challenge and an opportunity without precedent. Concerned that this occasion be used to attract the greatest possible number of undergraduates of high calibre, the Conference made these recommendations concerning this first content-course:

1. That, whatever its format, the course be conducted in the foreign language. The flexibility and patience which this may require

---

1. Needless to say, all discussions in this document of possible achievement within given periods of language study, as well as the programs later predicated upon such assumptions, are intended to apply only to the common Western languages. In the case of other languages, especially those which do not use an alphabetic system of writing, comparable levels of achievement would require many more contact hours. For students of such languages, intensive summer courses would seem indispensable. See A Survey Of Intensive Programs In The Uncommon Languages, Summer 1962, by Hoenigswald, McCarus, Noss, and Yamagiwa, prepared under contracts with the U. S. Office of Education.

of the faculty at the outset will be well repaid in the students' interest and sense of achievement.

2. That, where possible, the students use separate texts of the works read, and not an anthology, and that complete works be read wherever practicable. Even if the students are to read only a portion of a work, it is useful for them to see how this portion relates, in size at least, to the work as a whole. Such portions should, of course, be substantial enough to be meaningful.

3. That the necessary background material be subordinate to the analysis and explication of the works read. The tendency in the past for the opposite to be true has given the useful term "survey" an unfortunate connotation.

The Conference also recommended that consideration be given to the establishment of an alternate course at the same level as the above, but with an emphasis on the culture or civilization of the country involved. Courses of this sort have been found successful with Advanced Placement Program freshmen who often have already completed the equivalent of the literary course before entering college. Such an alternative might prove attractive also to students who are not strongly inclined toward literature, or provide a welcome change of fare for some who are.

The Major Program

Basic to the success of the major program is the need not only to maintain the language skill previously acquired but to add to it by at least one term of advanced language study each year until graduation. Many undergraduate departments assume that this need can be met merely by requiring majors to write occasional reports in the foreign language. The writing of such papers, while certainly to be encouraged, will

provide, at best, exercise limited to the forms and vocabulary peculiar to literary history and criticism. This is not enough for the modern undergraduate. Whether he is to be a teacher or a useful world citizen, he must be competent in his chief foreign language to handle situations far beyond the bounds of belles lettres, or even of academic usage. Such competence is not acquired by chance; it must be systematically cultivated.

To define and describe the degree of proficiency in the foreign language which might reasonably be expected of majors, particularly those intending to teach, would really call for a professional consensus. Fortunately, the equivalent of such a consensus already exists: the "Statement of Qualifications of Secondary-School Teachers of Modern Foreign Languages,"[1] produced during the FL Program's first decade. Approved by every important foreign-language organization, it describes three levels of proficiency - "Superior," "Good," and "Minimal," - in terms of certain degrees of fluency, and other abilities in the foreign language. The descriptions contained in the "Statement" would make possible a subjective evaluation of the majors' achievement, if this were thought desirable. However, the MLA Proficiency Tests for Teachers and Advanced Students[2] suggest themselves as a valuable instrument for a more objective evaluation. The advantages of such testing are too obvious to need elaboration: two which occur immediately are determination of the relative positions of individuals in a group; and diagnosis of strengths and weaknesses of individuals with respect to certain skills.

---

1. PMLA, September, 1955, Part 2.
2. MLA Foreign Language Proficiency Tests for Teachers and Advanced Students, MLA Testing Program, Miriam M. Bryan, Director, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey.

The most important advantage as concerns the preparation of teachers and scholars (for some of these test areas can have a bearing on scholarship) would be the establishment of a better standard for the proficiency of majors than now exists. Such a standard should probably correspond to "Minimal" or "Good" or some intermediate point, as might be determined by the departments concerned.

Members of the Conference were desirous that the above insistence on the need for sustained language development not obscure their conviction that the chief component of a liberal arts major in a foreign language and literature should continue to be the study of the literature. At the same time they wished to stress their belief that proficiency in the language is by no means discordant with the appreciation of its literature, particularly for such purposes as textual criticism. They argued furthermore that the concept of the unitary nature of the work of art, so easily lost sight of when the work is the product of another culture, can be more consistently realized and better preserved if the work is treated in the context of its own language. The Conference therefore urged that all upper-division courses in literature be given in the foreign language. They pointed also to the practical consideration that disappointment and dissatisfaction with the use of English in advanced foreign-language courses was, even in the years of diminishing proficiency, a large factor in the loss of prospective foreign-language majors.

The courses in literature should deal chiefly with periods and genres, masterworks and literary analysis, and should represent a minimum of 18 semester-hours.[1] One of them, in senior year, might well be of the

---

1. Agreement could not be reached as to whether this figure should include the course commonly used as an introduction ot literature, or should consider such a course as a prerequisite.

seminar type, requiring written and oral reports, and, perhaps, the preparation of a substantial essay in the foreign language. It is clear, however, that the number and kind of courses will vary with individuals and departments. With the expected increase in school preparation, it is quite probable that more seniors will take one or more graduate courses, thereby easing their graduate program. On the other hand, students who begin their modern language in college may require summer courses here or abroad.

It would not appear necessary to argue the need for, or at least the advantages of beginning the study of an additional foreign language in college. Such equipment was the normal expectation in the days of narrow, positivistic research; an era of broad syntheses, such as that upon which we are now entering, seems hardly the time to narrow our focus. If anything, the more efficient language-learning techniques now available should encourage its expansion. An additional language should be started in time for the student to carry it through two years, at least, with the first of these years semi-intensive. The student might then be expected to attain a meaningful level of achievement in the added language before graduation from college.

Without wishing to detract from the educational values of the art, history, music or philosophy with which the language-literature major has traditionally been encouraged to round out his program, it must be pointed out that two relatively new disciplines, cultural anthropology and linguistics, will be of more immediate relevance to him as a future teacher. Although linguistic science is not endowed with the magic power attributed to it by some enthusiasts, its value in the classroom has been demonstrated beyond question. The anthropological

point of view, especially cultivation of the ability to see another culture in its own terms, will deepen and enrich our majors' appreciation of our own disciplines, and enhance their effectiveness as teacher-scholars and as individuals. A special course based on this viewpoint, but focused directly on a relevant culture, would obviously be most helpful. In the present scarcity of such offerings, an appropriate course in cultural anthropology would partially serve the purpose while adding to the students' general education.

Travel and study in the country of the foreign language not only benefits the students' command of the language but adds a new dimension of reality to what otherwise remains an academic experience. It should, however, be carried out, whether for a summer or for a longer period, in connection with a responsible academic organization. The Conference felt strongly that such foreign experience deserves broad financial support to place it within the reach of all able foreign-language majors.

After careful consideration of the many difficulties faced by liberal arts students preparing to enter secondary-school teaching with only a bachelor's degree and desiring at the same time to acquire a strong subject-matter major and a well rounded education, the Conference agreed to make only the following recommendation: That a foreign-language department which regularly prepares students to become secondary-school teachers should provide, in addition to the major program recommended herein, appropriate training in methods under a member of the department who has demonstrated competence at the secondary level. The Conference noted with much interest, however, the growing tendency to make a five-year program a normal prerequisite for teaching.

The following tabulation illustrates the Conference's recommendations for majors with varying degrees of secondary-school preparation. "0" refers to the student who begins his major language in college; "2-3" to one who enters with average preparation; "4+" to one with superior preparation. Semester-hours are used for convenience.

	Year	0	2-3	4+
Language	Fresh.	6-8[a]	6	3
	Soph.	6	6	3
	Junior	6	3	3
	Senior	3	3	3
Literature	Fresh.	-	-	3
	Soph.	-	3	3
	Junior	6	6	6
	Senior	12	9	6[b]
*Linguistics		3	3	3
*Culture or Cultural Anthropology		3	3	3
		39-41[c]	36[c]	30[c]

a: Some colleges allow additional credit for a course with extra contact hours plus language laboratory.

b: Presumably a portion of these hours will be on a graduate level.

c: Of a normal minimum graduation requirement of 120 hours, "0"'s major consumes only 33.3%, "2-3"'s only 30%, and "4+"'s, 25% or less.

*The two courses here recommended, although so useful to our majors that they should be at least informally required, should not be thought of as an addition to the specialized program; they make a valuable contribution to the liberal arts electives.

Because of his initial handicap, the student represented by "0" will understandably have to devote a greater proportion of his time to his major foreign language. In return - provided his institution has an adequate complement of advanced language courses (Phonetics, Conversation, Composition, Stylistics, etc.) - he will

have achieved real proficiency. Administrative restrictions may prevent him from beginning the recommended second foreign language. If this is so, and he intends to work for his doctorate, he should be required to find intensive summer courses in the other language.

While the Conference was unanimous in affirming the need to insure continuing language development by requiring course-work in that area throughout the program, there was less agreement as to the number of hours to be devoted to literature. A fair proportion of the conferees felt that 18 hours were not sufficient, but yielded in the face of evidence that most colleges would not allow a larger total. They would like here to record their belief that, where it can be fitted into a well rounded program, and provided it does not interfere with the recommended language training, a more extensive coverage of literature should be encouraged.

IV. THE GRADUATE PROGRAM

"For years bitter complaints have been lodged against graduate schools for their failure to recognize preparation for teaching as a primary function. Though the graduate school is the traditional gateway to secondary-school and college teaching, and three-fourths of its products enter that field, it is claimed that this fact has been practically ignored...Whereas the doctor begins his clinical work in the third year of training, increases it throughout the fourth, and then spends from one to five years in internships, the college professor may complete his Ph.D. and join a college faculty without so much as one lecture on the art of teaching, one hour in clinical experience, or a single reference throughout his period of training to the problems of the profession. The engineer has his field training, the lawyer his moot courts, legal aid clinics, visits to the courtrooms, the doctor long years of clinical experience, but the college teacher begins his career frequently without benefit of any instruction in the art and science of the profession which he is entering."[1]

* * *

"We represent some five hundred colleges...which are the chief employers of the products of the graduate schools...it seems to me that we might have more weight in influencing the policies of the graduate schools, at least to a small degree, so that the teachers who come to us from there might be somewhat better fitted for the work for which we employ them."[2]

The above quotations have been chosen as representative of a body of opinion concerning the nature and purpose of American graduate education, opinion that is older than the oldest graduate school, and that lost out, as it were, when advanced education was finally launched. The dissatisfaction it expresses with the exclusive cultivation of pure scholarship by and for individuals who for years must earn their living by activities of a very different sort has grown more acute as the

---

1. Oliver C. Carmichael, Report of the President of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching for 1948
2. Quoted in Bernard Berelson, Graduate Education in the United States, N.Y., 1960, pp.28-29, from an address in 1925 by Raymond Hughes, president of Miami of Ohio

effects of our socio-economic revolution have made themselves felt on the nation's campuses. When the untrained Ph.D. of 1900 faced his first classes, he found a highly selected homogeneous group, drawn mostly from his own socio-economic class, products of a relatively relaxed, uncritical, authority-respecting society. His counterpart of today, the untrained, barely matriculated, graduate teaching assistant, years younger and without the assurance of a master's degree, not to mention a doctorate, must in many instances confront a roomful of mixed backgrounds and preparation, tense, critical, and often heedless of authority. The most ironical feature of this contrast is the much greater need today's confused undergraduates have for the best information, skill or guidance they can get - which only by the purest chance will they get from such an assistant.

Teachers of modern foreign languages and literatures, who have now assumed a role of prime importance in the national interest, must accept a new responsibility as well. The responsibility lies in imparting values of communication skills and greater understanding for other cultures, including their best expression in literature. The full and proper discharge of this responsibility imposes much heavier teaching demands than ever before. The new language-teaching, for example, calls for an unprecedented command of the language, and requires energy, resourcefulness, and pedagogical skills in class and in the laboratory which were rarely necessary in the past. These are things that simply cannot be successfully picked up as you go, as could the old checking of translation, line after line, the recitation of rules and paradigms, and the correction of sentences. The understanding of another culture, if gained at all in the past, was grasped in flashes

of insight over long years of effort, but not by a method which could be passed on to others. Literary analysis and criticism most of the older generation had to dig out for itself. This haphazard and wasteful process, for all its eventual satisfactions, can be spared today's students, and must be if the profession is to thrive.

In circumstances such as these, the graduate schools should feel obligated to stop assuming that good teachers simply happen. The pressures have grown too great to permit such blindness to continue. Fortunately, the profession is not confronted with the need to choose between teaching and scholarship; the situation is well described by Berelson:

> "The real question is not which side of the dichotomy is right, but rather how much of one to pay for how much of the other, or still more, how to keep them in a harmonious and productive relationship." (p. 41)

The Conference was realistically aware that no recommendations for change could be prescriptive or dogmatic. There were represented too many years of graduate school experience, and too many examples among those present of diversity of practice, for members not to realize that specifics of application and implementation of any recommendations would have to be shaped to fit local circumstances. The important thing, they felt, is for the profession to agree on the added elements needed to bring graduate training into harmony with a reality which must include skillful, knowledgeable teaching. It should be clearly understood, therefore, that the Conference's recommendations are only indirectly concerned with the main corpus of graduate work, the study of literature and training in scholarly investigation.

In order to crystallize their opinion of what is needed, the conferees discussed at length the teaching assignments which might

confront the young instructor in his first full-time employment. They agreed upon the following qualifications which he would need in order to discharge his duties in the classroom:

1. Mastery of the major foreign language.

2. Ability to plan and conduct first- and second-year courses in that language in accordance with the best modern methods.

3. Ability to convey some understanding of the culture of the people concerned, their patterns of behavior, beliefs, points of view, etc.

4. Ability to present in the foreign language on a lower division level, its literary masterpieces in such a way as to convey an understanding of why they are masterpieces.

In order to confer these teaching qualifications, the graduate program would have to include the following:

1. <u>Continuing formal training in the major foreign language</u>:

Since the undergraduate and graduate programs for those who are to teach form a continuum, courses should be planned to complement the entering student's achievement in college. In the transitional period, before the nationwide improvement has made itself felt at the graduate level, admissions should be more selective. If, in spite of this, students are found to have serious language deficiencies, they should be required to take appropriate undergraduate courses. A graduate division must provide, and an undergraduate division must require, that a prospective teacher demonstrate a thorough command of all language skills before he is put before a class.

The importance of making sure that prospective teachers have a real command of the language calls for accurate methods of evaluation. Here, again, the MLA Proficiency Tests for Teachers and Advanced Students will supply the need. If they are taken before entrance to graduate school, the results will be ready, well before the beginning

of the term, to furnish valuable diagnostic evidence with respect to the student's language skills. If they cannot be taken until the students' arrival in the fall, they would still be of some value. In any case, no graduate assistant should be entrusted with a class until he has demonstrated his proficiency by these or by comparable nationally standardized examinations.

2. Training in the principles of language teaching and learning.

This should be a graduate-level course in methods. Ample material is already available to justify a semester's credit, and more is accumulating all the time. Among the topics which should be treated are:

1. Introduction to the nature of language, to provide a basis for enlightened analysis of methods of teaching a foreign language (unless this has already been acquired in a course in linguistics).

2. Analysis of the various methods of teaching language, with emphasis on modern methods, at the elementary, intermediate, and advanced levels, including a critical examination of instructional materials and facilities.

3. Principles and practice of modern test construction and interpretation.

4. Demonstrations, observation and critique of classes in session, and supervised practice teaching,

5. Introduction to the profession: discussion of organizations, journals, etc.

Considerable latitude should be expected in the arrangement of this course, as may be found in the dozen universities where it is already being given. In some, it is completely theoretical; in others, it is associated with actual teaching. Reports based on experience testify to a higher level of student interest, motivation, and, hence, success, when instruction is integrated with teaching, than when it is entirely theoretical. A particularly valuable arrangement is to have the methods

instructor conduct a regular undergraduate-course section at an hour when all his graduate students may be expected to attend and observe. It would not seem necessary to stress the importance of putting such a course in charge of an experienced and enthusiastic language teacher.

3. Training in the principles of linguistic analysis.

A minimal requirement in this area might consist of a one-semester course beginning with an introduction to general linguistics, followed by one or more contrastive studies of the major language and English. For those with the time and interest there should be available additional courses in pure linguistics and in the history of their major language. Like language, literature, and culture, linguistics taken as an undergraduate should be carefully evaluated to determine if it has given the student the needed orientation. Since it is the competence that is important, not how or where it was acquired, the undergraduate major and graduate program should be regarded as a continuum.

4. Training in the principles of cultural analysis.

Again, unless an equivalent course has been taken in college, cultural analysis and the culture of the foreign country should form a one-semester course for all graduate students. It should cover these elements:

1. The dominant values, taking into account differences among regions, social classes, and age groups.

2. Key assumptions about the nature of man and the world; contributions to knowledge.

3. Art forms, including types and proprieties of humor; great artistic achievements.

4. Social institutions: familial, religious, educational, economic-occupational, political and judicial, intellectual-aesthetic, and recreational.

5. Adaptation to geography and climate; achievements in technology.

6. Attitudes toward foreigners, and behavior expected from them.

7. Prevalent types, or characteristics of personality structure, and the "socialization" procedures by which the patterns are taught and assimilated.

Important parts of the needed content will be found in the selective bibliographies prepared by Laurence Wylie and others.[1]

5. Training in the presentation of literature to undergraduates.

There was less clear-cut agreement by Conference participants on the need for formal training in the teaching of literature because of a general feeling that literature is, after all, the chief subject of graduate instruction. Yet it must be admitted that graduate students, apt to imitate methods of presentation they experience, find few graduate courses which would serve as models for the kind of courses they are likely to have to teach as young instructors. Not only is this difference natural, but it will probably become even more pronounced if graduate schools adopt the pattern of independent work-cum-seminar. It would seem wise, therefore, for any training program to include organized instruction in the various approaches to literary analysis, appreciation, criticism, and explication on an appropriate level. Here, too, class visits and observation will prove useful by providing examples of student reactions and questions, and successful ways of coping with them.

---

1. "Six Cultures (French, German, Hispanic, Italian, Luso-Brazilian, Russian): Selective and Annotated Bibliographies," in Reports of Surveys and Studies in the Teaching of Modern Foreign Languages, 1959-1961. New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 1962, pp. 253-275. See also "Culture in Language Learning," Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 1960.

It will be remembered that the Conference, in making the above recommendations, was concerned with providing training in the art and science of teaching which would enable the young instructor to function in the classroom more effectively and with greater confidence as he enters upon his first full-time position. It later realised that the benefit of those provisions would be largely limited to the relatively small number who leave the graduate school with the desired degree, or at least, with a well-conceived thesis in progress. From their own experiences and observations, and with the results of the MLA teaching-assistant questionnaire still vivid in their memories, its members knew that the measures they had recommended would be of little help to the hundreds of individuals who would have to begin teaching under less fortunate circumstances. The need of these would be much greater, and their students no less important. The Conference therefore agreed upon the following recommendation:

> Before a student begins teaching in either school or college, we urge that, in addition to his study of the foreign literature, there be formal provision for the improvement of his command of the language, and that he take at least one course each in the Teaching of Language and Literature, the Principles of Linguistic Analysis, and the Principles of Cultural Analysis.
>
> Where circumstances require the student to serve as teaching assistant <u>in his first graduate term</u>, we urge emphatically that the course in the Teaching of Language and Literature be taken concurrently.

During their four days' discussion of the requirements of professional training and the means by which these might be met, Conference members considered also the difficulties they and their colleagues might encounter in applying the recommendations. They found encouragement for the future in the steady improvement in foreign language training. Already noticeable on the lower undergraduate levels, the

better command of foreign languages should facilitate the adoption by colleges of major programs such as are recommended in the preceding section. As this improvement reaches the graduate schools, it should, perhaps within a decade, reduce the time required in the graduate program to insure and maintain language mastery. Reflected, as it must be, in increased knowledge of the foreign literature, this general improvement will eventually enable numbers of A.B.'s to fulfill some graduate requirements before admission.

Between the present and the happier future just envisioned, there stands, however, an inevitably difficult period of transition. Fortunately, legislation has been placed before Congress to provide assistance in the form of summer institutes, or seminars, where college teachers on several levels may receive the professional training now lacking in graduate programs. This possibility will be discussed in a later section.

The following sample programs are offered to illustrate possible applications of the Conference's recommendations. It will be obvious that the greater variety and lack of uniformity typical of graduate-school requirements render such samples less meaningful than those offered on the undergraduate level. The use of semester-hours was dictated by their general familiarity. The programs are based on the sample Undergraduate Programs found at the end of the preceding section.

1. Undergraduate "O" Program; language mastery "Good," goal is "Superior;" took Cultural Analysis as part of liberal education; had no time for Linguistics; minimum coverage of major literature; full-time student.

Fall Term		Spring Term	
Language Improvement	3 cr. hrs.	Language Improvement	3 cr. hrs.
Linguistics	3 cr. hrs.	Language Teaching	3 cr. hrs.
Major Literature	6-9 cr. hrs.	Major Literature	6-9 cr. hrs.

Note: Language Improvement might be so organized as to extend over two terms with credit for one.

2. Same student, but must teach four hours.

Fall Term		Spring Term	
Language Improvement	3 cr. hrs.	Language Improvement	3 cr. hrs.
Language Teaching	3 cr. hrs.	Major Literature	6 cr. hrs.
Major Literature	3 cr. hrs.		

Note: Linguistics postponed until second year.

3. Undergraduate "2-3" Program; language mastery "Good," goal "Superior;" took both Cultural Analysis and Linguistics and one or two extra courses in major literature; full-time student.

Fall Term		Spring Term	
Language Improvement	3 cr. hrs.	Language Improvement	3 cr. hrs.
Language Teaching	3 cr. hrs.	Major Literature	9-12 cr. hrs.
Major Literature	6-9 cr. hrs.		

Note: Language Improvement might be so organized as to extend over two terms with credit for one.

4. Same student, but must teach four hours:

Language Improvement	3 cr. hrs.	Language Improvement	3 cr. hrs.
Language Teaching	3 cr. hrs.	Major Literature	6 cr. hrs.
Major Literature	3 cr. hrs.		

5. Undergraduate "4+" Program; language mastery "Superior;" has had both Cultural Analysis and Linguistics; also one or two graduate-level courses; full-time student.

Fall Term	Spring Term
Regular Program	Regular Program

Note: Language Teaching to be postponed till near time of putting it into practice.

6. Same student, but must teach four hours:

Language Teaching	3 cr. hrs.	Regular Program
Major Literature	6 cr. hrs.	

7. Undergraduate, ordinary present program; 6 hrs. Composition and Conversation above second year; 18 hrs. major literature; language mastery "Minimal +;" full-time student.

Fall Term		Spring Term	
Language Improvement	3 cr. hrs.	Language Improvement	3 cr. hrs.
Linguistics	3 cr. hrs.	Cultural Analysis	3 cr. hrs.
Major Literature	6-9 cr. hrs.	Major Literature	6-9 cr. hrs.

8. Same student, must teach four hours:

Language Improvement	3 cr. hrs.	Language Improvement	3 cr. hrs.
Language Teaching	3 cr. hrs.	Linguistics	3 cr. hrs.
Major Literature	3 cr. hrs.	Major Literature	3 cr. hrs.

Note: If he has serious lacunae in his major literature, Linguistic Analysis would better be postponed till following year, along with Cultural Analysis.

* * * * *

If, as the Conference hopes, legislation is enacted authorizing summer seminars for college language teachers, some newly appointed graduate assistants will be able to attend a seminar before entering graduate school. In that case they will begin both their graduate studies and their teaching with the benefit of instruction in methods of teaching language and literature, and increased competence in the foreign language.

V. EVALUATION

The Conference was well aware of the fact that, should every one of the country's graduate schools find it possible and desirable to adopt the preceding recommendations beginning with the next academic year, the results of such training, especially in the language skills, would offer wide variations in quality. And as the Conference looked to the near future with its picture of greatly increased college populations, it was fearful that the rising pressure to obtain instructors would favor the preparation and employment of incompetent personnel. It felt, therefore, that to state the qualifications needed for college language teachers, even to battle for them, would have little meaning or value without a corresponding device by which to measure relative achievement. It stated this belief, together with a proposed solution as follows:

Standards of Competence for Beginning Foreign-Language Teachers

> It is clear that in the next decade, the numbers of college students will increase even more rapidly than since World War II. There is great danger that the colleges in acquiring the staff to accommodate these numbers of students, as they must, will relax standards of teaching. To avoid such a lowering of standards, the teaching profession must move with urgency toward the establishment of national professional standards.
>
> As a first step toward the establishing of these standards, command of the four language-skills should be evaluated by the MLA Proficiency Tests for Teachers and Advanced Students before a prospective teacher is entrusted with a college class.

The futility of attempting to equate proficiency with credit-hours has been demonstrated over the years by the chaotic situation which has existed in the area of state certification of public school teachers. The meaninglessness of requirements stated in those terms

has contributed to a deterioration of instruction in foreign languages no less than in other fields.

Thirty-five years ago, Professor C. M. Purin, in his excellent but little-known study, The Training of Teachers of Modern Languages, regretted the lack of tests which "would be most enlightening both for a general knowledge of the situation as it now exists...and for diagnostic and creative purposes for the future."[1] One of the outstanding benefits of the NDEA of 1958 has been the creation, aided by the Research Program of Title VI, of a battery of tests developed by the Modern Language Association designed to fill this need. The tests are seven in number, and cover, in addition to the four language skills, Civilization, Linguistics, and Professional Preparation. These MLA Foreign Language Proficiency Tests for Teachers and Advanced Students have had extensive use and stand ready, in two equated forms in five languages, to serve the needs of the profession.

In order for these tests to produce the results of which they appear capable, the Conference recommends that a project be undertaken, with government or foundation support, to arrange for the experimental administration of the MLA Tests in the four language skills, on the largest possible scale, to college majors in the relevant languages at a time near graduation; and, similarly, to graduate students in these languages toward the end of one, or possibly two, years' residence. The Conference recommends further that these tests be administered at no cost to the cooperating institutions or to the individuals tested.

The need for measures to be taken to enable the MLA tests to

---

1. Vol. 13, Publications of the American and Canadian Committees on Modern Languages, 1929, p. 9.

function properly should be clear from the several instances in the present text where their usefulness has been cited. Definitely superior to the Graduate Record Examination in the measurement of language skills, these tests, if administered at the end of the Undergraduate Program and again at the end of the Graduate Program, would serve several valuable purposes. First, they would enable undergraduate departments to measure the final achievement of their majors according to a recognized scale. The results of this same testing would inform language departments of the language proficiency of the students who had taken them, and determine each student's need for additional language training in graduate school. If the tests were to be used as partial demonstration of a student's readiness for teaching, the Conference felt strongly that the tests should be given also at the time when the student proposes to begin his teaching career. In other words, the proficiency must be measured as it exists when it is to be used, and not as it may have been at some time in the past.

Until this recommendation can be implemented, Conference members felt it would be very desirable for the availability of the tests to be more widely publicized in PMLA, the AAT journals, and the state FL bulletins. If, later, a clearing-house for inquiries could be added to the MLA's many services, the chances of the tests' being widely known and used would be greatly improved.

VI. NDEA SEMINARS FOR COLLEGE TEACHERS[1]

The Conference is convinced of the need for improvement in the teaching of modern foreign languages to undergraduates, and of the importance, for such improvements, of certain changes in graduate programs and practices. It is aware of a number of factors, all understandable, which may delay these changes, perhaps for years, whereas the need for action is urgent and immediate. The most promising solution to this conflict appears to lie in government assistance of the kind which met a similar emergency in the public schools by the creation of the NDEA language institutes. The Conference is accordingly very gratified to learn that legislation is now before Congress to provide similar training for college teachers. For the benefit of those who may eventually have to plan and administer such a program, the following guidelines are offered.

Institutes for Whom?

In the light of experience with the NDEA institutes for secondary-school teachers, several categories should be recognized from the outset. Useful criteria for differentiation might be, inter alia, (a) amount of teaching experience, (b) degree of mastery of the foreign language, (c) amount of direct experience with the foreign culture, and (d) the candidate's age and the professional impact of the training.

Thus, the lowest category, presumably Level 3, would take college

---

1. Since 1958 the term "institute" has been associated with training programs for elementary- and secondary-school teachers. With no thought of depreciating the work of those institutes, but for administrative convenience as well as to emphasize the different character of graduate-level programs, the term "seminar" is proposed for the latter.

graduates without experience holding a first appointment as teaching assistants for the following academic year. These should be further grouped by degree of language mastery. With these might go teaching assistants with brief experience, again with attention to proficiency in the language.

Other groups, presumably all experienced teachers, would con-- stitute Levels 1 and 2. These would include instructors and assistant professors, divided by age and language mastery, as well as by administrative responsibility, and such other factors as may occur in actual practice. Employing criteria such as the above, one might establish a workable basis for the differentiation of three levels of seminars.

Where - At Home or Abroad?

It is an established fact, illustrated by NDEA Second-level Institutes, that, all other factors being equal, advanced work in a modern foreign language can most profitably be performed in the country where that language is spoken. Institutes held in the United States suffer inevitably from a constant tension between the effort to maintain a "cultural island" and the distraction of the surrounding culture to which the participants belong, and to which they are constantly being drawn; in the foreign country - actually "native" to the target culture - the cultural ambience, on the contrary, exerts a constantly reinforcing influence. The Conference therefore expressed the following opinion:

> In order to be able to teach effectively students of more mature minds, especially those at advanced levels of study, it is imperative that the teacher have the experience on which to base first-hand interpretation of the cultural and social system of the people whose language he teaches.
>
> The Conference recommends that as many seminars for college teachers as possible be established in the country of the target language for the following reasons:

(1) to permit complete exposure to the target language

(2) to permit immersion in the cultural life of the people and direct contact with social institutions.

In view of the higher costs of foreign seminars, it would appear important that they be used primarily for those best prepared to profit from their special advantages. This might be interpreted, for example, to favor the choice for foreign seminars of certain candidates qualifying for Level 1 or highest-ranking seminar. If, then, the principle of Second-Level Institutes should be applied to the Seminar Program, it would be possible to give this foreign experience also to graduates of Level 2 or Level 3 Seminars. One of the most important factors in distinguishing among individuals approximately equal in other respects would be the recency and extent of their experience in the country involved.

Organization and Curriculum

In reading the following discussion of topics which might be appropriate for graduate-level seminars, it must always be remembered that (a) this is a list of areas in which different courses might be developed to suit the needs of individual institutes; (b) it may well be that not every seminar would find it desirable to include every area listed.

1. Language Improvement: This is a good example of an area which would presumably be represented in all seminars, but by courses whose level, content, and method would differ according to the type of participant. Anyone familiar with the achievements and shortcomings of college majors in the several language skills would expect to find, in seminars for fledgling assistants, courses in advanced composition

and in remedial phonetics, with laboratory work as part of the latter. In a higher-level seminar there might be criticism of essays, or of professional-type translation.

2. Theory and practice of teaching language and literature: Here, too, flexibility and discretion should be used in shaping the kind of work to be done, and the relative emphasis to be attached to the two fields. Beginning assistants who will spend their 4-6 hours in an elementary course should be trained accordingly, with less time on other matters. For these participants, especially, observation of a master-teacher at work would be extremely helpful in giving added life and meaning to the theoretical presentation. Such an arrangement might be possible on a campus with a regular summer session. For seminars on higher levels, whose participants also teach literature, the emphasis might be different.

3. The nature of language: This would include linguistic analysis, applied linguistics, contrastive phonology and structure. It is important here to avoid the tendency to confuse this area with the preceding one, methods. Perhaps because American linguists, like a number of language teachers, emphasized the spoken language even before "audio-lingual" was coined and popularized, the two have been equated. While the organization of courses in this area should remain flexible, it should be borne in mind that all work in the graduate-level seminars would be bona fide graduate work. Courses of this sort are now being given in a number of graduate schools, and it is our hope that they will become a normal part of graduate programs in modern languages.

4. Theory and practice of teaching literature: This area probably contains more "fighting words" than any of the preceding. Many today

would probably stress the direct approach to the work of art, and the development of suitable techniques and standards. Others would prefer to present varied approaches, and for them a course might be based - just as an example - on a text such as Wellek and Warren's Theory of Literature. Another possibility to consider would be a series of presentations by representatives of different approaches to literature. Again, there are those who are convinced that the best course in approaches to literature is built around an actual course in a type or period of literature which becomes a sort of demonstration course. In a graduate-level seminar, as in any other graduate work, it would be dangerous to try to make a convinced adherent of any approved system give a course in which he does not believe. Finally, it must be recalled that some seminars would not find this area at all suitable, while others would prefer to offer a course in this area in lieu of the methods of teaching literature included in Area 2.

5. Contemporary foreign culture: This area, too, offers a considerable degree of latitude. Some would concentrate on information about the manners, mores, the social, emotional, intellectual, and institutional patterns of the people who speak the language. Others, following the same general method, would put more stress on the contrasts between the foreign culture and our own. For still others, information itself would be subordinate to the development of a methodology for penetrating another culture.

It is understood that the foreign language would be the normal medium of communication. In addition to lectures and reading in the foreign language, provision should be made for small discussion groups, informal but with adequate supervision. Language improvement must not

skimped; if we can imagine two teachers equally skilled in method, there is no doubt that the one more proficient in the language would produce better results.

General Observations

The problem of securing adequate staff, hard enough for NDEA institutes, would be at least as difficult in the case of the proposed seminars for college teachers. Even though there would be far fewer seminars than there were institutes, the supply of faculty members of requisite stature and experience is equally limited. Consequently, should the necessary legislation be enacted, it is to be hoped that the country's strongest foreign language departments will wish to make their graduate faculties available by submitting proposals for such seminars.

As a further measure to cope with the staffing problem, the Conference envisioned the possible establishment of a very small number of special centers, or super-seminars, for the training of personnel and, perhaps, the preparation of materials. Such centers might well prove to be the most effective means of utilizing a very few available experts in a given field; working with a limited number of highly selected candidates already specializing in that field, they could not only serve the needs of the seminar program but could provide results of lasting benefit for the country as a whole.

After consideration of all the factors involved, the Conference recommended that the principle of rotating the seminars among universities be considered. This should be applied, of course, within limits. Experience with NDEA institutes, for example, indicates that efficiency would be served by the same university's giving a seminar for two

successive years.

Academic credit was another of the problems considered by members of the Conference. They agreed that an intensive program of courses such as is outlined herein, under the most highly qualified academic direction, pursued successfully over a period of seven or eight weeks, should entitle a graduate student to at least the normal summer session's six hours' credit toward his degree. The possibility that it might be difficult in certain circumstances to identify the credit with a recognized area in a given curriculum should not, it was felt, obscure the fact that the credit had been earned by work of graduate calibre performed by a graduate student under the instruction of graduate faculty.

It is to be hoped that no proposal would be entertained which lost sight of the fact that this program has been devised to give training <u>in the art of teaching</u> to individuals who heretofore have been taught almost everything except that.

The following graduate-level seminar programs are offered as samples:

Level 3:- Chief objectives: language improvement and methodology; primarily for those without teaching experience.

	M	T	W	T	F
8:10	Observation of College Elementary Course				
9:10	Criticism and Methods				
10-10:30	Break: conversation in the language				
10:30	Review of Basic Struct. Patterns	Phon.	Basic Struc.	Phon.	Basic Struc.
11:10	Pattern Drill	Drill & Lab.	Drill	Drill & Lab.	Drill
12-1:20	Lunch in language				
1:30	Culture (Daily)				
2:30	Discussion in language				
3:30	Individual activities, reading, preparation of assignments, language laboratory, etc.				

Level 2:- Chief objectives:- new methods, language improvement, culture; for instructors and assistants with experience.

	M	T	W	T	F
8:10	Observation of College Intermediate Course				
9:10	Criticism and Methods				
10-10:30	Break: conversation in the language				
10:30	Advanced Patterns	Phonetics	Adv.Pat.	Phon.	Adv. Pat.
11:10	Drill, Oral and Written	Drill & Lab.	Drill- O & W	Drill & Lab.	Drill- O & W
12-1:20	Lunch in language				
1:30	Culture	(Anal. (of Lit.	Culture	(Anal. (of Lit.	Culture
2:30	Discussion	(& Prac.	Dis.	(& Prac.	Dis.
3:30	Individual activities, reading preparation of assignments, language laboratory, etc.				

Level 1:- Chief objectives:- clarify methods; prepare for training and supervision of assistants; Remedial Phonetics; Linguistics and Literary Analysis.
For experienced teachers, circa assistant professor rank.

	M	T	W	T	F
8:10	Linguistics (daily)				
9:10	Methods Problems	Remedial Phonetics	Meth. Prob.	Rem. Phon.	Meth. Prob.
10:00	Break: conversation in the language				
10:30	Literary Analysis (daily) and Discussion				
12:00	Lunch in language				
2:00	Techniques and Problems of Supervision	(Remedial (Phonetics	Super.	(Rem. (Phon.	Super.
3:00	Material Preparation	(& Lab.	Mat.Prep.	(& Lab.	Mat.Prep.

Except for Linguistics and Literary Analysis, most courses in seminars on this level would probably be of seminar type. These are mature persons, with experience to draw upon; they will want to contribute. Materials Preparation, Remedial Phonetics, and Language Laboratory Techniques would not necessarily be taken by everyone. A course in Contemporary Institutions might be more suitable for some. Seminars for mature, experienced faculty-members would obviously call for great flexibility and tact.